



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Association and the Modern Language Association (as well as the newly founded Political Science Association), and among university publications, the *American Journal of Theology*, the *Journal of Political Economy*, the *Quarterly Journal of Economics*, the *American Journal of Philology*, *Modern Philology*, and the *Bulletins* of the University of Wisconsin. The schools at Athens and Rome are duly recorded but not the school at Jerusalem.

As regards American historical work in general, M. Langlois declares it decidedly promising, but so far rich only in works on American history, "treated mainly from a religious, economic, or sociological point of view"; whereas it can hardly be disputed that it is the constitutional, political, military aspects of our history which have received most attention. "The United States", he adds, "have made very few contributions of the first rank to the history of classical antiquity and medieval Christendom", the case of Mr. Lea being quite unique. As far as classical history is concerned, the reproach is entirely just. In spite of all the advantages of time, money, and special privileges which the study of the classics has enjoyed in America, it is extraordinary how little has been done to stimulate interest in Greek and Roman history and how small have been the American contributions to the world's knowledge of ancient history and life. The neglect of ancient history in our colleges and universities is, when all the circumstances are considered, one of the most serious charges that can be brought against American scholarship. As regards medieval history the criticism is not quite so well-founded. Every one will admit that Mr. Lea stands in a class by himself, but there is at least one field in which American scholarship has been steadily productive, namely, the institutional, legal, and economic history of England in the middle ages. If we bring together the *Essays in Anglo-Saxon Law* and the books of Bigelow and Thayer, Gross's *Gild Merchant* and lesser monographs, the investigations of G. B. Adams, Baldwin, and Lapsley in the field of medieval institutions, and the studies of Ross, Allen, Andrews, and half a dozen more recent writers upon agrarian conditions — not to mention research in the early history of English literature — and if we remember also that the best bibliographical works on English history are due to an American, we need have no reason to be ashamed of the results in this field. The total does not counterbalance the work of the country which can claim Gneist, Pauli, Brunner, and Liebermann, but it certainly outweighs that of any other continental country, France not excepted.

CHARLES H. HASKINS.

Histoire Ancienne des Peuples de l'Orient. Par G. MASPERO. (Paris : Hachette et Cie. 1904. Pp. 912.)

MASPERO'S work has long been accepted as a classic. It requires a rare combination of qualities to write a trustworthy and readable history of a period embracing many centuries and many different peoples; Maspero moves with ease through the mazes of his material, massing it into a unity and creating a story of real life in which the personages are nations.

This unity of presentation is made possible by the intimate relations that existed between the nations treated of, Egyptians, Babylonians, Assyrians, Phœnicians, Hebrews, Medes, and Persians. It was, perhaps, this sense of unity that led Maspero to give the title *Ancient History of the Peoples of the Orient* to a book that omits Arabia, India, and China ; the history of these latter peoples is, however, not unimportant. The successive editions of Maspero's work have kept pace with discoveries in various fields ; the present edition, for example, the sixth, has a notice of the important Code of Hammurabi, which was discovered about two years ago. The last instalment of the English translation, edited by Professor Sayce, appeared in 1900, the other parts being several years earlier : in the last ten years the original work has been greatly enlarged. The recent elucidations of Egyptian history are due in no small measure to the researches of Maspero himself ; in this field he is an acknowledged master. His opinions as to Egyptian origins have not undergone serious modification. He still holds to the close relationship between the Egyptian and the Semitic languages, and therefore to the existence of a primitive Egyptian-Semitic people. In regard to certain questions relating to the prehistoric period he is non-committal. Did the first Egyptians enter their land from Asia or from the Mediterranean African coast ? Maspero declines to decide between the two routes. He gives, however, a long account of predynastic Egypt (based on recent excavations), and insists on the remarkable maintenance of two types, the peasant and the aristocratic, both of which, he thinks, may be seen to-day in Egypt. The traditional first king, Menes, till recently a somewhat shadowy figure, has now become real ; his tomb has been discovered, and with him several other kings, whom Maspero, of course, takes as historical without, however, accepting Petrie's attempt to arrange them in historical order. Maspero is equally cautious in his treatment of the early religion of Egypt, giving no opinion concerning the origin of the cults of Osiris, Ra, Amen, and the others ; he holds, what is obviously the right view, that originally each district had its own deity, who was supreme in his own domain — the pantheonic system was the result of political unification and moral and religious reflection. A point of special interest in Maspero's account of the religious history is his view of the revolution effected by Amenhotep IV., who devoted himself to the worship of the disk of the sun (*aten*). This has been represented as a monotheistic movement due to Semitic influence ; it was in fact neither purely monotheistic nor Semitic, but a natural though ephemeral Egyptian development in the direction of unification.

In Egyptian history Maspero is an authority of the first rank ; in earlier Babylonian history he is dependent on the researches of others, and in doubtful or disputed points the views he gives are those of the writers he follows. Thus for the earliest historical kings (p. 188) he adopts the date B. C. 4300 without stating that there is difference of opinion on this point among cuneiform scholars, some of whom put the earliest known king 800 years later ; the chronological statement of Nabonidus,

accepted by Maspero as authoritative, is regarded by many as doubtful; Babylonian history is hardly definitely determinable before B. C. 3000. Another doubtful point is the origin of the African name Cush, a name that in the Old Testament is given both to the region south of Egypt and to a part of the Tigris-Euphrates valley (Nimrod is called in Genesis, X. a son of Cush). Maspero regards the African name as brought over by immigrants from Asia; this construction, though defended by some Assyriologists, is open to objections, and cannot be regarded as historically assured. However, the account of Babylonian history is in general excellent (thus the term *patesi* is correctly explained as meaning "prefect" or "dependent kinglet"); only, too much importance is attached to the "triads" in the religious system. In the later periods the historical facts are fairly well assured, and, with a few exceptions, Maspero includes the results of the most recent investigations. The Hebrew history is skilfully interwoven with that of the surrounding peoples. A singular though not very important inaccuracy occurs on page 792: it is there stated that some of the nobles of Jerusalem were exiled by Artaxerxes Ochus to Hyrcania, and in a foot-note reference is made to Josephus's *Antiquities*, xi. 7, 1; but Josephus's statement (which does not mention exile) refers to an entirely different affair, and the authority for the exile is the *Chronicle* of Eusebius.

C. H. Toy.

The Political Theories of the Ancient World. By WESTEL WOODBURY WILLOUGHBY, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Political Science in the Johns Hopkins University. (New York: Longmans, Green, and Company. 1903. Pp. xiii, 294.)

IN this book Professor Willoughby has made an important addition to the literature of the history of political theories. In English hitherto, except for numerous articles in the different journals, we have had only two or three works that need to be mentioned—those of Pollock, Dunning, and Merriam. Dunning's work, comprising so far only one volume, which is devoted to ancient and medieval times, might be supposed to render this history by Professor Willoughby superfluous, but the two books, although both dealing with the ancient theories, really occupy different positions. On the whole Dunning is only the objective historian, limiting "himself quite strictly", as Professor Willoughby points out (preface, xii), "to an account of political theories as they are to be found crystallised and explicitly stated in literature". Dunning is blind neither to the "contemporaneous facts of public life . . . of which the writings were born" nor to "the practical lessons which their authors endeavored to teach", as Professor Willoughby also recognizes, and this, as really only a part of the character of an objective historian, is both the merit and the defect of his work. Professor Willoughby, on the other hand, seeks beyond the bare facts, whether of life or theory, "the political presuppositions involved, . . . the political ideas implicit in the systems of governments and laws of the times and peoples consid-